1		1
1	UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT	
2	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
3	IN RE:	. Case No. 05-17923 (ASH)
4	DELTA AIR LINES, INC., et al,	. (Jointly Administered)
5	Debtors.	. New York, New York . Thursday, April 19, 2007
6		2:37 p.m.
7	TRANSCRIPT OF MOTION TO APPROVE CVG SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT	
8	BEFORE THE HONORABLE ADLAI S. HARDIN UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE	
9	APPEARANCES: (On the Record)	
10	For the Debtors:	Marshall S. Huebner, Esq. James I. McClammy, Esq.
11		DAVIS, POLK & WARDWELL 450 Lexington Avenue
12		New York, New York 10038
13	For the Official Committee	
14	of Unsecured Creditors:	Abid Qureshi, Esq. AKIN, GUMP, STRAUSS, HAUER
15		& FELD, LLP 590 Madison Avenue
16		New York, New York 10022
17		
18	(Appearances Continued)	
19	Audio Operator:	Electronically Recorded
20		by Court Personnel
21	Transcription Company:	Rand Transcript Service, Inc. 80 Broad Street, Fifth Floor
22		New York, New York 10004 (212) 504-2919
23		www.randtranscript.com
24	Froceedings recorded by electronic sound recording, transcript	
25	The state of the s	

shy, retiring, unheard violet.

1.0

I take it that there is -- we're not dealing here with any issue of fact. This is -- these are legal issues. Am I not correct in that?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I believe they are legal issues. We do have, as Mr. Aragon mentioned to Your Honor, very short deposition transcripts that go to the relevant documents and which we believe constitute admissions to aid the Court and for the record, so we'll be putting that on. I think they're just statements, but I don't believe --

THE COURT: All right. I'll hear it. It will be difficult and in the event that some witness, either intelligently or inadvertently, says something that's in conflict with what a document says, it seems to me it's going to be hard for me to base a ruling on that.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Understood, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I trust you wouldn't disagree with that.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I agree, Your Honor.

THE COURT: With regard to subject matter, there's no issue that I have subject matter jurisdiction under Rule 9019 to pass upon a proposed settlement. That's really not an issue, is it? There's a whole Point A of Mr. Huebner's memorandum that seems to me to be basically unarguable. Courts pass upon settlement agreements all the time.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Yes, Your Honor. We made mention --

I think the reason they put that in is we made mention that we believe that there was a question of subject matter jurisdiction and I can address that. I won't belabor the Court's time and take too much on the issue of subject matter jurisdiction.

Of course, Your Honor, we agree Your Honor, under 28 U.S.C. 1334(b) and 157, would have subject matter jurisdiction to rule on a 9019 motion such as this and to entertain it --

THE COURT: Resolving claims.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Because the only difference that we had made was that -- because we had challenged whether or not the proper parties were before the Court, we know it's the debtors' motion so arguably technically the other settling parties are not parties, they're not the ones who filed the motion, but we did have issues. They go more to the merits and I think the power and authority of the Court, so I agree, Your Honor, we don't have to get into a long dissertation on, you know, this Court's related to jurisdiction or power over part. We really do believe the thrust of the argument is to the power and the authority of the Court to grant the settlement motion that has been filed by the debtors.

THE COURT: All right. Another sort of prefatory

point: You haven't, as Mr. Huebner pointed out, taken any

issue with the basic -- well, two basic propositions: one, the

approval of settlement agreements, barring some legal defect,

bondholders may disagree. Obviously, the debtors have represented that they believe a majority, not all but a majority, think this is a good settlement for them, but we do not believe it's a good settlement for us and we don't believe it's a good settlement for all bondholders.

THE COURT: Would you want to be carved out? Do your clients want to be carved out of the settlement so that they take no benefit from the settlement but are at liberty to litigate with the debtor? It's just a question.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: The answer is yes. We wanted an opportunity to opt out of that settlement and keep our bonds and keep our rights and be able to pursue our rights and remedies against, you know, with respect to the debtor, within this bankruptcy case, with respect to the trustee or KCAB, you know, based on what our legal rights are. We wanted to keep them. Yes, we wanted to opt out.

THE COURT: You want to opt out?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Yes.

THE COURT: Because I didn't discern that from your pleadings.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: We've asked --

THE COURT: Mr. Huebner has risen portentously.

MR. HUEBNER: Just to help, Your Honor, as you know, I think it's fair to say that we have found a lot of very creative corporate solutions to problems like this. An opt out

is really not feasible here because, first of all, what they really want to do is retain their right to sue the airport and the trustee and, of course, we have indemnification obligations and the airport is a pass-through vehicle and we're ninety percent of their traffic, so really any opt out is an opportunity to try to sue Delta for hundreds of dollars on prepetition bonds because clearly we get a discharge, the only two people left are the trustee and the airport.

We've also been advised, because we asked, that the trustee does not have it believes the ability or the readiness or the willingness to do a deal in which some bondholders can participate and some others can't. Frankly, I would have been very happy to take the risk of we'll litigate later, whether there's one claim or two, whether it's capped or not because we think, as you would have heard, that this is an unbelievably generous settlement and that there's a reason why 97.35 percent of the bondholders, with weeks of notice, exactly, I might note, as set forth and predicted in the disclosure statement as to mechanic, voted in favor of this. But on this one, I actually don't think it's going to work because the place that it's going to round trip is ultimately back to reorganized Delta and we need to buy finality which is frankly why we paid so very handsomely.

THE COURT: All right. Okay. Well, if I could ask some questions, you'll help me I'm sure with some of the points.

and I'm actually going to give you a simple answer because I've got a lot of binders here and even more tape flags.

Is KCAB liable on the bonds? You got kind of a complex answer. I'm just going to read from the document. Section 2.05.

"The bonds shall not constitute a debt liability or obligation or pledge of the faith and credit of the issuer, Kenton County, Kentucky, or the Commonwealth, on any political subdivision thereof, within the meaning of any constitutional or statutory provision whatsoever, but shall be limited in special obligations of the issuer, payable solely from the trust estate" --

Which is, of course, specifically defined in a way -I'm sure you can guess what it's defined as.

"The bonds shall not be payable from or charged upon any funds other than the trust estate pledged to the payment thereof, nor shall the issuer be subject to any pecuniary liability thereof. No holder or holders of the bonds shall ever have the right to compel any exercise of the taxing power of the issuer, or any other unit of government to pay the bonds or the interest thereon, nor to enforce payment thereof, against any property of the issuer, nor shall such bonds constitute a charge, lien or encumbrance, legal

or equitable, upon any property of the issuer. The statutory mortgage lien provided for under KRS 103-251 is hereby waived by the issuer, and the trustee shall not be applicable to the project facilities or constitute security for the payment of the 1992 Series A or B bonds."

Put that one up on the screen.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I'm going to put it up on the screen right now, Your Honor. The tennis match keeps going. Let's put up KCAB's reply brief, Page 10. This is direct from KCAB. There's the Kentucky law at issue here, Your Honor.

MR. HUEBNER: That's not the section we said you could put up on the screen. Put it up on the screen.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I'm arguing.

MR. HUEBNER: 205. That's what you said. Put it up.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I'm going through this statutory provision because KCAB also put it up. This is from their brief, Your Honor.

They say, in one, the title is application of revenue, changes for use. They say, at one, and Delta, you know, tries to argue, as well, on this, that at or before the issuance of the bonds, that's their highlighting, the city legislator or body or fiscal court or county, as the case may be, shall, by ordinance resolution, set aside and pledge the income and revenue of the industrial building, including the airport